

LOWER PAXTON TOWNSHIP
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

Minutes of Special Workshop Board Meeting held August 22, 2006

A special workshop meeting of the Board of Supervisors of Lower Paxton Township was called to order at 5:40 p.m. by Chairman William B. Hawk on the above date in the Lower Paxton Township Municipal Center, 425 Prince Street, Harrisburg, Pennsylvania.

Supervisors present in addition to Mr. Hawk were: William C. Seeds, Sr., William L. Hornung, Gary A. Crissman, and David B. Blain.

Also in attendance were George Wolfe, Township Manager; Donna Speakman, Finance Director; Bill Weaver, Authority Director; Sam Robbins, Public Works Director, and Brian Luetchford, Parks and Recreation Director.

Pledge of Allegiance

Mr. Hornung led the recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Public Comment

No public comment was presented.

OLD BUSINESS

Review of the strategic planning process being undertaken by the Supervisors and management personnel

Mr. Hawk noted that each member present had an opportunity to rank the needs and issues and return the information to Mr. Wolfe for him to compile the results. Mr. Wolfe explained that each need was ranked first by department, and then overall by township. He noted that he did not identify the individual responses for both the Board members and management as he did not think it was relevant. He stated that he performed the categorical and overall ranking separately for the Board members and for management, and suggested that the categorical ranking would be helpful to each department head when planning future budgets.

Mr. Hawk noted that the Pennsylvania State Association of Township Supervisors (PSATS) sponsored a leadership seminar and one of the suggested items was to tie planning with the budgeting process. He noted that the Township is further ahead of other Townships. Mr.

Wolfe agreed that the Township is ahead of the bar as it undertakes this type of analysis and planning.

NEW BUSINESS

Review and ranking of the list of items identified through brainstorming

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would concentrate on the overall rankings for the purpose of what is to be discussed this evening. He noted that two additional charts show the categorical responses by the Board members and management with a cumulative average. He noted that there were five sets of responses from the Board members and six sets of responses from management. He explained that Board members have the final decision on all matters, but have graciously permitted management to participate in the discussions. He noted that the cumulative average would be used by the department heads to plan their future budgets on a year-by-year basis. He noted that the last chart (salmon color) shows the cumulative overall averages for every item Township-wide. He noted that the highest priority arrow shown on the side of the chart listed the needs that averaged above the number four; three and a half to four is listed as high priority; three to three and a half is listed as priority; two and a half to three is listed as having a lower priority; and anything below two and a half is shown as not a priority. He noted that this is based upon the cumulative average of the Board members and management.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are only seven or eight projects listed under the highest priority category, and he noted that the Board of Supervisors had more projects under the highest priority listing than staff. He noted that the yellow, blue and green arrows are almost the same for all three charts. He explained that the Board members found a core group of projects more important than staff, and that it is important to know what projects the Board members find to be more important than staff. In addition, the Board must determine how many of the 16 highest priority projects can be completed. He noted that staff could only complete a certain number of the highest priority items within a certain time period.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the overall average for Board members was 3.1 as compared to 3 for staff. He noted that there were ten projects that showed a greater discrepancy of more than one point, and the staff engineer need showed a difference of 1.7 between the Board members and management. He noted that the Board members rated it at 2.6, whereas management rated it a 4.3.

Mr. Blain noted that one of the top priorities is the Nyes Road Corridor, with management rating it 3.5 and Board members rating it 4.8. Mr. Wolfe noted that there was a 1.2 difference in the Technology category too. He noted that the Beaver Creek Wet Weather

Treatment Plant was rated significantly lower by the Board members with a 1.4 difference. In addition, the Sanitary Sewer Mini-basin projects were rated at 2.7 by management and the Board members rated it at 4.2. He noted that improvements to the Compost Facility had a 1.2 difference, and the Wolfersberger Tract and the fire fighter's discount card showed a 1.8 difference.

Mr. Blain questioned who was included in the ranking process for management. Mr. Wolfe answered that it included Bill Weaver, Donna Speakman, Sam Robbins, Brian Luetchford, Dan Bair, and himself. Mr. Blain suggested that department heads may not know much about certain projects and that may explain the difference in the ratings. Mr. Wolfe suggested that each department head would rate their concerns higher than another department's concerns.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the highest priority category lists projects currently underway except for the increase in volunteer firefighters. He noted that it was strange that the fire fighters discount card ranked 2.1, the fire fighter's service increment pay ranked 2.2, one fire company ranked 2.1, and unified fire fighter services manual ranked 2.5. He suggested that this shows that the Township knows that it needs to address the shortage of fire fighter's, but it does not know how to do. Mr. Blain noted that the Township needs more fire fighters's and suggested that a fire service study should be completed to review the equipment and overall service needs, and then determine what perks should be provided to the volunteer fire fighters.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the three personnel issues for the Public Works Department that include additional foreman, additional management personnel, and the need for additional operational space all ranked as low priority, whereas the overall analysis of services in relation to provide services ranked high. He suggested that the Township should step back and take a good look at what it needs to do. He noted that it would not make sense to expand the public works building if it was determined that too many services are provided and there is a need to cut back on the amount of services provided.

Mr. Wolfe noted that there are three problematic concerns that he found and they are found in the non-priority category. He noted that the Conway Road relocation at the land fill was rated a 2, however, the Township has verbally committed to this. He noted that the Township is starting the engineering for that project since Phase Five of Kendale Oaks will be starting next year. He noted that if this is not a priority then it needs to be addressed immediately. Mr. Crissman suggested that it may have been dismissed as it was an out-of-sight, out-of-mind issue. Mr. Blain noted that the Board members committed to this project and must follow through with their commitment. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it should be moved up to at least a

priority concern in the three to three and a half point range. He noted that the dog park at the closed landfill would be a relatively inexpensive project, and the Parks and Recreation Board has been actively working on this issue. He noted that he has received numerous requests for a dog park in the Township. Mr. Luetchford noted that it is the most consistent request received in the past two or three years. He noted that the last item of concern was the support for the Koons Park Pool and it was rated at 2.3. He explained that he was told that they may not open the pool next year, and he suggested that the Board should be prepared to know what it intends to do if this happens. He questioned if the Township would be willing to provide a higher level of support, or just allow the pool to close.

Mr. Blain noted that this process is a very good start but the second step would be to calculate the costs. He noted if the dog park could be built in-place for a very inexpensive price, then, maybe it should be completed, even though it is only ranked a 2. Mr. Wolfe noted that given the in-house staff, and associated services such as Steve Stine and HRG, Inc. there is only so much work that can be completed. He noted that he must ensure that there are enough people and resources to meet the timeframe and completing a lower priority project may take away from the ability to implement another project. He noted that the intention of the plan is not to add additional staff to complete the projects.

Mr. Hornung suggested that there should be some type of reconciliation in the areas of large discrepancies between staff and the Supervisors. He noted that a decision should be made on the topic of Conway Road, and there needs to be further discussion between staff and the Board members in order to complete the process. He noted that there is a need for approximate costs for the projects as well. Mr. Blain suggested that costs should be determined before the list is updated, as well as the projected time frame for each item.

Mr. Hawk noted if you take the categories on list to “Developing New Marketing Plan for the FCC”, there is not a whole lot of difference between managements and Board members ratings, and the next five categories are not that far off either. He questioned what would happen if he took the listed items down to “Developing a New Market Plan”, and the supervisors re-ranked those categories. He questioned if they would be the same or would the other group’s ranking influence the new ranking system. Mr. Hawk noted that the rankings are relatively close. Mr. Hawk noted that by taking the remaining five on the list, it would provide an opportunity to re-rank the dog park, Koons Park and Conway Road issue. Mr. Crissman noted that management and Board members were relatively close for the Conway Road issue and the dog park. Mr. Weaver suggested that the lower ranking for those two issues was due to the lack of knowledge

concerning those issues. He noted that he was not aware that the Conway Road issue was a verbal agreement made by the Board members. Mr. Crissman noted that these issues should be added to the top ten issues.

Mr. Crissman suggested that an additional column should be added to this list noting the responsible department in order not to overload one particular department. He suggested that this should be taken into consideration along with the estimate of cost for each project.

Ms. Speakman suggested that since the Township is already committed to certain projects, for instance, George Park, should it be part of the five year planning process. She noted that some of these projects are committed to contracts and will be completed within the next year or two. Mr. Hawk noted that he noted that he did not think of the commitment made to Kendale Oaks in regards to the Conway Road project. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it may be good to review each issue one-by-one to get the consensus of the group. He noted that the first three issues are all projects that are underway and can't be stopped. He noted that the hiring of the Human Resource Officer is almost completed, but the Township is not committed to this concern yet, but with the high ranking, he would assume that everyone is in agreement with this issue. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Nyes Road corridor has been budgeted and PENNDOT has been petitioned to push this concern to the top of their list.

Mr. Wolfe suggested that the issue for increasing the volunteer firefighters should be removed, and replaced with the Township fire study issue at the current priority level. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Township should develop a marketing program to attract volunteer firefighters. He noted that there may be a cost for advertising. Mr. Wolfe suggested that the issue would be addressed primarily by conducting a fire services study to determine how to best utilize the volunteers, encourage volunteerism and then go from there. He noted that the study and the increase of volunteers are really the same concern.

Mr. Crissman noted that the dollar amount is an additional column that should be added to the chart. He noted that overloading a single department would set the process up for failure.

Mr. Hornung noted that a few years ago, a person made a presentation to the Board to discuss ways to increase volunteerism, and he would like to see that person come back and discuss the issues with the Board members. Mr. Wolfe suggested that he would reword the issue to increase the Township's knowledge of way to increase volunteerism. He noted that this may have a great financial impact on the Township down the road if it is not addressed now.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the sewer maintenance program can easily be calculated for costs, since the Township is required to do this as part of the consent decree. Ms. Speakman questioned

what the different was between that, implementing the second consent decree, and Act 537 Plan. Mr. Weaver noted that the second consent decree and Act 537 Plan only includes the Beaver Creek Plant. He noted that the decisions for the Paxton Creek have not been made yet. She questioned if the maintenance program would be part of these two issues. Mr. Weaver noted that the flows are not allowed to increase for the Township. Mr. Hornung questioned if the Township is doing a maintenance program at this time. Mr. Weaver answered that there is no maintenance program; rather the Township is repairing problems as they become aware of them. Mr. Seeds noted that the preventative maintenance is preformed at the sewage plants. Mr. Weaver noted that it is not performed for the overall systems, unless the flows go up. Mr. Hornung suggested that this is not as high a priority as it was originally thought of. Mr. Weaver suggested that it would be more of an issue after the plant is built, possibly five years from now. He noted that he has no idea of how the current sewer system will react to the new plant. Mr. Hornung questioned if this issue should be put on hold. Mr. Wolfe noted that management ranked this issue at 3.5 and the Board members had it at 4.2. Mr. Hawk suggested that this was based on current sewer systems problems, but if it is contingent on the new wet weather treatment plant, then this is a different matter, as it may not be needed for a couple of years. Mr. Weaver noted if the decision is made to build mini-basins for the Paxton Creek using Township personnel, it may result in the replacing of half of the system over the next 15 years. Mr. Wolfe noted that the ability to make that decision won't occur until next year at this time. He noted that this issue would be two years out and it should be moved further down the list.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the next item is the contingency plan for Emergency Medical Services (EMS) which is very similar to the long-term financial needs for the EMS that is ranked five spots below on the priority list. Mr. Hornung questioned if this is a time bomb ready to go off. Mr. Seeds answered that it is. Mr. Wolfe noted that the other issue is the need for a EMS organizational change. Mr. Hornung suggested that all three issues should be lumped together as one to develop a contingency plan. Mr. Crissman noted that this category may have a short and long term goal. Mr. Seeds noted that someone from EMS will be asking the Board of Supervisor, in the near future, for more funds. Mr. Hawk noted that the amount of giving from the various Townships is very lopsided. Mr. Crissman noted that the Township pays the largest share, and it may be forced to give more funds or take over the operations since the other municipalities are not giving their fair share.

Mr. Blain suggested that it might be better to conduct a meeting with the various municipalities to determine what is the long term solution for EMS and how can they work

together to keep it operational. He noted that they may all determine that there is a need for a change in management. Mr. Crissman questioned if this occurred, would the other municipalities give their pro-rata share. Mr. Hawk suggested that it would not change the financial situation. Mr. Crissman questioned if the Township should bail the EMS out in order to keep them in service, or let them fold and develop a contingency plan to develop a Township system, and let the other municipalities fend for themselves. Mr. Hornung noted that this decision must be made. Mr. Blain noted that a regional ambulance makes more sense than a Township owned service, and that is why he suggested sponsoring a meeting with local municipalities to determine what they want to do. He noted then the group could go back to South Central EMS and make their demands to them. Mr. Hornung noted that, in the past, none of the Townships have worked together on issues, but this may be an issue that will work. Mr. Seeds noted that the other Townships are not aware of the severity of the problem. Mr. Blain noted that if they are not interested in being part of a solution, then the Township will not bail out the other Townships. He noted that it should be solved on a regional basis, but if it isn't, then the Township should have a contingency plan. Mr. Hornung suggested that a meeting should be devoted entirely to this issue.

Mr. Hawk suggested that SCEMS should charge the various municipalities based on population. Mr. Crissman noted that a pro-rata fair share should be developed, and the organizational structure should be improved. Mr. Hawk suggested that West Hanover Township only pays \$2,000 or \$3,000 dollars for services. Mr. Seeds suggested that it may be more like \$6,000, whereas the Township pays \$112,000 a year. Mr. Seeds noted that it should also be determined what percentage of memberships is paid by residents from each municipality.

Mr. Crissman questioned how the assessment is determined for each Township. Mr. Seeds answered that it is based on the number of calls. Mr. Blain noted that by the intensity of the discussion it shows that this is a very high priority item. Mr. Crissman noted that this should be the topic for a future meeting to develop an action plan. He noted that he would like to know what each municipality pays.

Mr. Hawk noted that Susquehanna Township pays for its own ambulance service. Mr. Blain noted that Swatara Township is going to pay for its resident's membership. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township pay \$112,000 a year in addition to the membership fees paid by the residents. Mr. Crissman suggested that contact should be made with Swatara Township to get information to use as a possible model for our township.

Mr. Wolfe noted that both entities ranked the analysis of staffing needs for public works to meet the service needs very close.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the issue of enhancing the Township's north/south corridor is the next item of concern. Mr. Wolfe stated that it would be very difficult to put a dollar amount to this concern. He noted that there are at least ten traffic installations that should be installed costing \$¼ million per installation. He noted that the Board may need to develop a policy for these types of issues to determine how many traffic signals should be installed over what period of time, and how much money should be allocated to complete these projects. Mr. Hawk suggested that a consensus should be reached on the definition of enhancing the north/south corridors. Mr. Wolfe questioned if this should be a joint effort with developers, or completed solely by the Township. Mr. Seeds questioned if it could mean adding more roads. He suggested that PENNDOT could add an exit to Colonial Road off of I-81.

Mr. Hornung questioned how many traffic lights were installed in the past ten years. Mr. Wolfe answered seven or eight new signals were installed in the past ten years by the Township and developers. He noted that the Stray Winds Farm Traffic Impact Study found that improvements are needed for Valley Road/Crums Mill Road/Devonshire Road traffic signals, Earl Drive and Crums Mill Road. He noted that the Osteopathic Hospital identified three traffic signals that will be needed in the future at Arlington Avenue at Londonderry Road; Avila Road and Londonderry Road; and Scenery Drive at Londonderry Road. Mr. Wolfe noted that in the past, the Township has allocated funds to do traffic signals in bulk on Linglestown Road under one contract. He noted that it would cost \$¼ million per-year for a traffic signal. He noted that he had no idea what to estimate for enhancing the north/south corridor.

Mr. Hornung noted that the Nyes Road improvements, which was already listed, and Colonial Road improvements would be a major component of these enhancements. Mr. Seeds questioned if the connection to Route 22 for Nyes Road would be included in this option. Mr. Wolfe noted that this is a recommendation of the Comprehensive Plan, and it would be very expensive to do this. Mr. Seeds questioned if it could connect with Blue Ribbon Avenue. Mr. Wolfe noted that both corners of Rt.22 are developed. Mr. Wolfe questioned if the Township would invest funds into the extension or relocation of Nyes Road. Mr. Hawk suggested no since there is no way to access Nyes Road without the extension. Mr. Wolfe suggested that a long-term solution may be the extension of Deaven Road to Allentown Boulevard. He questioned if this should be included in the five-year plan. Mr. Seeds suggested that it should not be included in this plan. Mr. Wolfe noted that the improvements to Nyes Road would be an enhancement to the

north/south corridor. Mr. Blain noted that the PENNDOT is in the process of bidding the engineering study for design work. Mr. Wolfe noted that any construction work would be a few years out, and PENNDOT may be looking at a 20% match for project costs. Mr. Wolfe noted that the road may not last that long. Mr. Robbins noted that the road was not designed for the amount of traffic that uses it. Mr. Blain noted that PENNDOT has moved the plan up to the four-year plan, but it will take some time to complete. Mr. Robbins noted that PENNDOT is performing routine maintenance on the road at this time. Mr. Weaver suggested that he would replace the sewer lines as the road is re-constructed.

Mr. Wolfe noted that the next issue of concern would be to hire a staff engineer. He noted that the marketing plan for the FCC is underway, and all the items in the middle section, except for the comprehensive plan, are able to be calculated for an approximate price. He noted that there is a significant rating difference with the issue of hiring a staff engineer.

Mr. Crissman noted that he reduced his ranking due to the recent negotiation of a contract with HRG, Inc. for a new contract. He rated this lower, assuming that staff would feel the same way. Mr. Hawk noted that he rated this lower.

Mr. Hawk noted that four items of concern were lumped together and this sets the total number of issues of concern at 19. Mr. Wolfe questioned at what section of the list the Board members wanted to stop for planning with a certain time-frame. Mr. Hornung suggested that the first two priority categories be included. Mr. Crissman suggested that a cost analysis should be completed for the highest and high priority items only.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff was happy or not happy with the contract negotiated for the township engineer. Mr. Wolfe suggested that staff interpretation of the item is different from the Board members. Mr. Crissman questioned what the real issue is with this concern. Mr. Seeds noted that staff wants an in-house engineer to work with, and not to have to call HRG, Inc and wait to get an answer for most mundane concerns.

Mr. Weaver noted that he has tried to minimize the engineering fees and costs for his department. He explained that he hired inspectors to do some of the work that CET was doing. He noted that their costs were almost double from what the Township paid. He noted that development is not going to slow down in the near future, and the developers are charged a very high price. He noted that it costs a lot of money to have a HRG, Inc. engineer review a plan. He noted that at staff level, the Sewer Authority could share the costs of an in-house engineer, which would save some of the funds paid to CET, and the Township would save money as it would only have to pay half the costs for an in-house engineer. He noted that it would provide for

continuity between the plans for the sewer and other engineering concerns. He noted that now, two separate firms review the plan, CET Engineering for the Sewer Authority, and HRG, Inc. for the Township.

Mr. Hornung questioned if there would be a savings if the Township hired an in-house engineer. Mr. Robbins answered that he believed this to be true. He noted that an in-house person could review a plan, noting that HRG, Inc. would still need to review the plans at some point, but continuity is missing at this time. Mr. Hornung questioned where the savings would occur. Mr. Wolfe noted that this would not result in a faster process, but rather, staff is looking for someone to go to with expertise when they encounter problems. In addition, they are looking for someone to coordinate and watch over the plan review process.

Mr. Wolfe noted that Mr. Robbins found an issue on Goosevalley Road near Chelsey Falls, with the cross pipes on Goosevalley Road being undersized that will need to be replaced. He noted that having more internal controls would help to eliminate these oversights, and make the Township more efficient. Mr. Seeds questioned why the cost to replace the pipes would have to be born by the Township. Mr. Wolfe answered that the Board members approved the plan. He noted that HRG, Inc. reviewed the plan, and the project could have been better coordinated. Mr. Robbins noted that when you review the plan in the field and as it is being built it is usually found that something could have been done better on probably all projects. He noted that the pipe size under Goosevalley Road should not have been missed in the review process. He explained that the Township should identify concerns during the review process, and the plan should be as clean as possible before the developer seeks Board approval. Mr. Hornung questioned if the engineer would review all the plans or only small plans. Mr. Wolfe answered that the staff engineer would coordinate plan review and serve as a reviewers check performing a spot review to ensure that the Township's engineers are doing what they are being paid to do. Mr. Wolfe noted that it would be a check and balance with HRG, Inc., CET Engineering, and staff. Mr. Wolfe noted that the developer pays for the plan reviews. Mr. Weaver noted that the in-house engineer would have some time to review some of the smaller plans.

Mr. Crissman questioned if staff was asking for an additional staff person and not the elimination of hired engineers. Mr. Robbins noted that that is correct. Mr. Crissman noted that this engineer would be available to staff for immediate consultations and site visitations. Mr. Seeds noted that the engineer would be a liaison between the individual departments and their engineering firms. Mr. Wolfe noted that the Township receives plans using multiple engineers

that have issues and concerns. He suggested that this problem may never be eliminated, but a staff engineer would ensure a more efficient overall product.

Mr. Hornung questioned if only one staff person could be hired, should it be the Human Resource Manager or an in-house engineer. Mr. Wolfe noted that his choice would be the Human Resource staff. Mr. Wolfe noted that this has been an on-going staff discussion for a long time, noting that the Township has had in-house engineers in the past. He noted that Mr. Weaver and Mr. Robbins are very frustrated when they are confronted with an engineering dilemma created by the contracted engineers and are unable to resolve those problems. Mr. Seeds noted that the Township has served as a training ground in the past for their in-house engineers, with them leaving to seek employment elsewhere.

Mr. Crissman noted that he understands the needs, but he did not understand the need for two engineers. He suggested that it would be better to let HRG, Inc. go and only use the in-house engineer. Mr. Wolfe noted that an in-house engineer could not do what HRG, Inc can do, for instance; survey work, aerial studies, traffic studies and traffic signal analysis. Mr. Weaver noted that he has tried to eliminate all the services that he was using that could be done in-house to save money. He noted that I & I Rehabilitation Crew have cut Rogele's profit by doing this project in-house. He explained that many sewer authorities are getting rid of consulting engineers and hiring their own engineer. He noted that development will never go away, and there will always be a need to review plans. He suggested that an in-house engineer could review plans for a much lower cost, but you would always need a consulting engineer for some work, such as wetland studies.

Mr. Crissman noted that when he assisted in the negotiations to hire HRG, Inc. he thought that that was what staff wanted, but now he senses that that is not what everyone wanted. Mr. Robbins noted that the Township needed to hire a consulting engineer, but the purpose for a staff engineer is not to replace the two consulting engineers, but to assist staff at the review level, project level, and standardization level. Mr. Hawk noted that using an in-house engineer may eliminate some instances when HRG, Inc. would not be needed. Mr. Crissman noted that he wants to be supportive of staff.

Mr. Hornung questioned how much the Township pays the consulting engineers. Mr. Wolfe suggested that it is close to \$500,000.00. Ms. Speakman noted that the price increases with special projects such as the Page Road extension and Thomas B. George Jr. Park.

Mr. Wolfe suggested that the gain would be more of an improvement in the quality of

work than cost savings.

Mr. Wolfe noted that he would add the name of the Department to the chart, a dollar amount if possible, and a time frame or year column. He noted that he would do this for the Highest and High Priority listings only.

Mr. Wolfe requested each individual to list up to five specific needs or issues that should be included in the top two priority listings from among the lower three priority listings. He requested this information within the next two weeks.

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Mr. Crissman made a motion to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Blain seconded the motion, and the meeting adjourned at 7:20p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Maureen Heberle

Approved by,

Gary A. Crissman
Township Secretary